DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 130 VT 008 222

Equality of Opportunity in Manpower Programs. Report of Activity under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
Pub Date Sep 68
Note-54p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.80
Descriptors-*Civil Rights Legislation, Employment, Employment Patterns, *Equal Opportunities (Jobs), *Federal Programs, Job Training, *Law Enforcement, *Manpower Development, Minority Groups, Program Descriptions, Social Discrimination, Unemployment
Identifiers-*Civil Rights Act Of 1964

The Manpower Administration maintains manpower programs and develops manpower plans and policy through its constituent bureaus or offices: Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, Bureau of Work-Training Programs, Bureau of Employment Security, Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation and Research (since absorbed as the administrations staff), and Office of Financial and Management Services. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 provides in Section 601 that "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits or, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." To this end, the Department of Labo r has established in the Office of the Secretary of Labor, the Office of Equal Opportunity Manpower Programs and has delegated to the special assistant in charge of this office the responsibility to direct and coordinate the department's civil rights programs. The present and future impact of this office and some of its problems and accomplishments are discussed. (CH)

ED029130

C.1

E 44

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY IN MANPOWER PROGRAMS

Report of Activity Under Title VI
of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

September 1968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Manpower Administration

3 (DOL), Washington, D.C.
FGK 45110

VT008222

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

The Secretary of Labor

Sir:

I transmit herewith my report to you of Title VI responsibilities of the Office of Equal Opportunity. This report covers the period from November 1, 1966 through October 31, 1967.

In this second report we have summarized as well as evaluated the progress of program operations for which we are responsible.

Sincerely,

Stanley H. Ruttenberg
Assistant Secretary and
Manpower Administrator

May 1, 1968

PREFACE

This report was prepared under the direction of Arthur A. Chapin, Special Assistant to the Secretary of Labor. Significant contributions were made by the Bureau of Employment Security; Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training; the Office of the Associate Manpower Administrator; and the Bureau of Work-Training Programs.

Acknowledgment must be made also for the important contribution of the Office of the Special Assistant for Equal Opportunity in Manpower Programs. Special recognition must go to Nelson S. Burke and Wayne J. Thompson.

CONTENTS

Report of the Title VI Program for the Manpower Administration
November 1, 1966 - October 31, 1967

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
THE MANPOWER PROGRAMS	3
Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training	3
Bureau of Work-Training Programs	6
Bureau of Employment Security	7
Manpower Administration Research and Special Programs	10
THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY OFFICE	13
IMPACT OF THE OFFICE	17
PROBLEMS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS	19
FOCUS ON THE FUTURE	31
APPENDIXES	35
1. Complaint Investigations	35
2. Complaint Investigations (city and state BES)	36
3. Complaint Investigations (city and state BAT, AMA, OTHER)	37
4. Complaint Investigations (city and state BWTP)	38
5. Routine Compliance Reviews	39
6. Routine Compliance Reviews (city and state BES)	40
7. Routine Compliance Reviews (city and state BAT)	41
8. Routine Compliance Reviews (city and state BWTP)	42
9. Number of Complaints	43
10. Number of Complaints (city and state BES)	44
11. Number of Complaints (city and state BAT)	46
12. Number of Complaints (city and state BWTP, AMA)	47
13. Complaints Referred to Other Agencies	48

INTRODUCTION

The problem of equality of employment opportunity for minorities in manpower programs is in reality a part of the employment problems of Negroes, Mexican Americans, American Indians, Puerto Ricans and members of other minority groups in the total labor force.

The extent of the need for training or retraining of minorities in these programs depends in some measure on the extent to which employers, both public and private, practice equality of opportunity for all Americans. Discrimination is one of the major factors in preventing maximum absorption of minorities into the labor force. It is recognized also that inferior educational institutions and poor health are contributing factors.

As of October 1967, the total civilian work force for people 16 years old and over was 78,132,000. Employed persons totaled 75,181,000; unemployed persons totaled 2,951,000. The whites in the civilian labor force totaled 69,352,000; the employed whites totaled 67,047,000. The nonwhites in the civilian labor force totaled 8,780,000; the unemployed nonwhites totaled 646,000. The rate of unemployment for whites was 3.7 percent; the rate for nonwhites was 8.8 percent.

The rate of unemployment for nonwhite teenagers between 16 and 19 years of age as of October 1967 was a staggering 33.0 percent.

The 8.8 percent unemployment rate for nonwhites does not reflect the acute rates of unemployment that exist in the economically and socially depressed inner cores of many of the large cities across the nation, largely inhabited by nonwhites.

While the unemployment rate for the metropolitan area of Cleveland, Ohio, for example, was 3.7 for the year ending 1966, the nonwhite section called Hough and surrounding areas had a rate of 15.6. The metropolitan area of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, had an unemployment rate of 4.3 percent for the same year, but for North Philadelphia, the predominantly Negro area, the rate was 11.0.

320-566 O - 68 - 2

THE MANPOWER PROGRAMS

The Title VI responsibilities of the Equal Employment Opportunity Office extend to a broad range of manpower programs subsumed under the Manpower Administration.

The Manpower Administration administers manpower programs and develops manpower plans and policy through its constituent bureaus or offices. These are the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training (BAT), Bureau of Work-Training Programs (BWTP), the Bureau of Employment Security (BES), the Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research (OMPER), since absorbed as the Administration's staff, and the Office of Financial and Management Services (OFMS).

Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training

In 1937 the administrative machinery was created within the Department of Labor to promote and foster apprenticeship on a nationwide basis. The law creating the machinery stated that the Secretary of Labor could "bring together employers and labor for the formulation of programs of apprenticeship."

Apprenticeship is a recognized method of learning a skilled trade. The training of craftsmen depends to a significant extent on day-to-day practice under the supervision of skilled journeymen.

Apprenticeship is a system in which the young worker entering industry is given thorough instruction and experience, both on and off the job in all the practical and theoretical aspects of work in a skilled trade.

The Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training stimulates and assists industry and trade unions in the development, expansion and improvement of apprenticeship and training programs designed to provide the skills required by an increasingly complex economy.

The Bureau's principal functions are to *encourage the establishment* of sound apprenticeship and training programs, *based on minimum quality standards* set by the Secretary of Labor, and to provide technical assistance to industry and labor in setting up such programs.

The apprenticeship system is based on voluntary cooperation among management and labor, industry and government, and the shop and the school.

This voluntary cooperation is reflected by national joint management-labor apprenticeship committees. These committees have been set up by national employer associations and international labor unions to set industry apprenticeship standards and to work out suggestions and methods for the development and improvement of apprenticeship and other training programs within their respective industries. Similar cooperation exists at the State level.

Placement in apprenticeship programs is mainly through local Joint Apprenticeship Councils (JAC's) which establish entry requirements and conduct interviews. These councils are composed of representatives from management and labor.

Most programs seek apprentices between 16 and 27 years of age. Many programs sponsors prefer high school graduates and spell out such personal characteristics as initiative and perseverance.

Apprenticeable occupations include more than 350 skilled trades, such as airplane mechanic, tile setter, baker, ironworkers, carpenter, general machinist, electrical worker, bricklayer, photoengraver, operating engineer, cement finisher, roofer and many others.

The training depends on the occupation. It combines a minimum of 144 hours of classroom training a year with on-the-job work for wages. Apprenticeship programs range from two to six years with the majority of four years duration, all coupled with related instruction.

Recruitment for apprentices is done through apprenticeship information centers, public schools, the local State Employment Service offices, the local labor union or directly by the employer. Testing is often done by the local State Employment Service office.

Title 29, Part 30, Code of Federal Regulations, issued by the Secretary of Labor, sets forth standards, policies and procedures in selecting apprentices to promote equality of opportunity in apprenticeship programs registered with the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training. These policies also apply to waiting lists, employment and on-the-job practices.

On-The-Job Training (OJT)

The On-The-Job Training[1] program was administered by the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training. On-the-job-training may be defined as the actual performance of the work duties in any occupation under the supervision and guidance of a trained worker or instructor.

Such programs are developed primarily to give job skills to the unemployed, the underemployed, and workers whose jobs are endangered by changing technology.

The following categories are eligible to obtain on-the-job training programs:

Individual Employers who would provide job-entry training to unemployed persons, or provide skill improvement training, or retrain workers whose skills have become or are becoming obsolete. . .

A Labor Organization which would provide apprentice-entry, refresher, upgrading or skill improvement training for unemployed or underemployed members and others seeking to obtain full-time employment or advancement. . .

A Trade or Industrial Association which would provide or arrange for training of unemployed persons, or retraining of presently employed persons, in specific apprentice-entry or other skills in demand among or by members of the association or industry, or

A Government, Community or other public or private agency or group which would directly or indirectly provide job entry or skill improvement training to unemployed persons who are to be hired, or to present employees when approved by the Manpower Administration.

The following are types of industries in which these programs are carried on:

- manufacturing or construction
- transportation or communication

---

[1] The program is now administered by the BWTP.

- wholesale and retail trade
- services
- government (not Federal)
- agriculture or mining

The following occupational areas are covered:

- skilled and semiskilled
- clerical and sales
- scientific and technical
- service
- semiprofessional
- agricultural

In these programs the Federal Government:

- reimburses job instructor fees
- pays for materials used in training
- pays for instructional supplies
- provides consultation and advice on training problems
- assists in developing training programs
- recruits job applicants
- arranges for group training for small shops
- arranges for area-wide training programs.

The Manpower Administration actively seeks the participation of national and regional businesses and industries, as well as large companies and international unions, in conducting local OJT projects under national contracts.

A prerequisite for an OJT contract is the need for trained workers in a particular industry. The Labor Department signs a contract with an association, company or union. (Prime contracts designate an overall number of trainees, the occupations, and the training cost in dollars.) The industry association or multistate company hires training coordinators (at Government expense) to promote, administer, and service the individual OJT projects among the members of the association, the branches, affiliates or dealerships of the company or locals of the union.

As the coordinators develop an OJT project with the units of the association, company, or union, an overall prime contract with the union or association is given approval by the Department of Labor.

The contractor has the responsibility to recruit and screen prospective applicants. He also assumes responsibilities for placement on completion of training.

Some Examples of OJT Programs

Here are a few examples of the types of OJT programs approved by the Manpower Administration:

- A national association of laundry owners hires a small staff of training coordinators who set up OJT projects among its member shops under an MDTA allocation covering the cost for 700 persons as well as the salaries of the training coordinator.

- A large automobile manufacturer, serving as the prime contractor, hires a training promotion staff to install OJT projects among its 6,500 dealers for one year apprentice-entry training for 1,000 unemployed as mechanics and body repairmen. Each dealer gets his own contract.

- A seafood processing firm in Oregon employs women, some on welfare rolls, to learn how to fillet fish in its plant.

- A labor union in California setting up training groups on the job for 60 unskilled members to learn a shortage skill as wood, wire and metal lathers.

- A group of fishing vessel owners in Massachusetts forming an association to enable it to hire 50 part-time dock workers and others to be trained on their trawlers at the fishing banks as full-time fishermen.

- A large Texas aircraft company winning a defense contract, advertising for semiskilled and skilled workers in a 10-state area without success, and embarking on an on-the-job training program for 210 new and underemployed workers to meet its needs for everything from tool designers and template makers to jig builders and press punch operators.

Bureau of Work-Training Programs

The Bureau of Working-Training Programs makes assistance available to chronically unemployed and poverty stricken persons, young and old, through Operation Mainstream, the Work Incentive programs, the New Careers programs, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Concentrated Employment Programs and On-the-Job Training.

The Scheuer Amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1965 created the *New Careers Program* which is designed to create and engineer new career-type jobs in public service as support to workers in professional occupations in such fields as health, education, welfare, neighborhood development and public safety. It is a program designed for adults. Priority is given to projects that will ease the workload of professionals and lead to permanent jobs with career ladders. Participants must be unemployed and generally come from families with incomes at or below the poverty level.

Operation Mainstream is designed to meet the occupational needs of eight million elderly people living in rural areas and small towns who subsist below the poverty level. Close to a million of these are at or near the starvation level. Its goal is steady work at decent pay for poor adults with a history of chronic unemployment. Priority under Operation Mainstream is given to projects that provide services and employment for older people and improve blighted areas.

To be eligible, an applicant must have been out of work for more than 15 weeks in a row, repeatedly unemployed during the past two years, or employed less than 20 hours a week for more than 26 consecutive weeks.

Recruitment, screening and testing are handled by the sponsor who may be a public or private non-profit agency. The Federal government pays 90 percent of the cost; the State pays 10 percent and this may be in kind.

Placement is handled by the sponsor who is also responsible for follow up.

The *Neighborhood Youth Corps* is designed to provide work experience and education to in-school and out-of-school youth. It is designed also to increase employability of these youth and to keep them in school if they are potential dropouts. The in-school enrollees must be at least 14 years of age; out-of-school youth must be between 16 and 21. Enrollees in the in-school program may stay until they finish high school. An out-of-school enrollee who takes part in additional education or training may stay for two years.

Sponsors assume responsibility for recruitment, screening and testing. Any group other than a political party that meets established standards may sponsor this program.

The *Work Incentive Program* authorized by Social Security Amendments of 1967 aims to move persons 16 or older off the welfare rolls into productive employment by providing concentrated manpower service specifically directed toward this target population. A variety of Federal, State, and local agencies cooperate to deliver manpower services, including HEW and State Employment Service offices. Local welfare agencies refer clients to the program.

The *Concentrated Employment Program* brings to bear all the different kinds of Federal resources available to the three cooperating agencies: The Department of Labor; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the Office of Economic Opportunity in magnitudes necessary to help those from low income families and the unemployed or underemployed in urban and rural slums achieve self-sufficiency. All persons in the CEP target areas who need such a concentrated program in order to become employed and self-sufficient are eligible for the program. At the local level the Community Action Agencies are primarily the sponsors of the program. The Employment Service participates in the program by recruiting and referring enrollees to training programs and arranging and referring persons to supportive services such as day care, health, and transportation services.

Bureau of Employment Security

The Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933 created the U.S. Employment Service and its affiliated State Employment Services. The Act read in part:

> . . ."Sec. 1. In order to promote the establishment and maintenance of a national system of public employment offices, there is hereby created in the Department of Labor a bureau to be known as the United States Employment Service."

The Bureau of Employment Security and State Employment Security agencies comprise the Federal-State employment security system. That system encompasses employment and related services for workers and unemployment insurance services.

The Bureau is responsible for gathering labor area information which takes into account factors influencing the demand-supply relationship. Such information is an indispensable local office tool for counseling and other job related activities.

Unemployment Compensation, which is a component of BES, provides benefit payments to unemployed persons and pays stipends or allowances to eligible trainees in certain manpower training programs.

The recruitment, testing, counseling and referral services of this Bureau affect the lives of millions of American citizens.

In 1961 the President assigned to the employment service system much of the responsibility for carrying out the new Federal manpower programs.

A broad *Human Resources Development* program was undertaken by the Employment Service in August 1966.

To provide operating bases for the new HRD program, the *Youth Opportunity Centers* which are a part of BES and are now established in 127 metropolitan areas throughout the country, have expanded their functions to provide services to the disadvantaged in all age groups. In addition, the facilities and services of ongoing organizations in slum neighborhoods--including community action centers and settlement houses--are widely used.

A pilot demonstration project involving multi-service neighborhood centers is being arranged for initially in 14 cities. These centers are a kind of social service "shopping plaza," housing under one roof as many community social agencies as possible, and providing central outreach, intake, diagnosis, follow up and community organization functions.

Among the services offered are adult and remedial education, legal advice, housing assistance, senior citizens activities, youth development resources and child development and parent information.

These centers are funded and given technical assistance by five Federal agencies organized into a joint steering committee under the chairmanship of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Other agencies participating are Labor; Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW); Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) and the Bureau of the Budget (BOB) which have joined with HUD in developing guidelines and standards for the centers and will assist in evaluating the projects and providing guides for wider application of the multiservices center idea.

Manpower Development and Training

The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (MDTA), as amended, requires the Federal Government to appraise the manpower requirements and resources of the Nation. Additionally, it requires the Government to develop and apply the information and methods needed to deal with the problem of unemployment resulting from automation and technological change and other types of persistent unemployment.

Title II of the Act calls for a program of direct action to upgrade the skills and employability of the work force and thus link jobs and men more effectively. The Congress authorized a program of institutional and on-the-job training to prepare workers for job opportunities. Further, this part of the Act authorizes basic educational training and a special youth training program for persons who need job training but cannot benefit from it without further training in basic educational skills.

This nationwide institutional training program is co-administered by the Bureau of Employment Security and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Bureau and the Department carry out their responsibilities through national and regional offices and affiliated State Employment Security agencies. HEW's training responsibilities are carried out by the Office of Education through the Department's regional offices, State educational agencies, and public or private local training agencies.

MDTA Advisory Committees

An essential part of the Act is the directive to the Secretary of Labor to appoint a National Manpower Advisory Committee. As directed by the Congress, this committee has a total of 10 members, chosen from the following groups:

- labor
- education
- management
- training
- agriculture
- the public in general

The committee is directed to make recommendations to the Secretary of Labor relative to his carrying out his duties under the Act. It must meet at least twice a year. At the request of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the committee also makes recommendations to that agency relating to its activities under the Act. Subcommittees review and evaluate MDTA research and training activities for all manpower programs and encourage systematic community planning as part of a national manpower policy. A panel on counseling and selection is studying the effectiveness of counseling, testing and selection activities related to MDTA training.

State and local manpower advisory committees review training proposals and serve as advisors to the public operating agencies. They also engage in activities to stimulate public awareness of the importance of the manpower training program and to assure State and local support for an effective national manpower development program. Regional Manpower Advisory Committees function as associate bodies of the National Manpower Advisory Committee to identify the specific manpower problems of a given area and to interest residents in these problems and the programs designed to meet them.

MDTA State Agreements

The provisions for the administration of the Act have a built-in decentralization feature. The Secretary of Labor is authorized to enter into agreements with each State, or with the appropriate agency of each State for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Act. The State Employment Service has responsibility for selecting, counseling, testing and placing trainees. Under the agreements, the unemployment insurance division of the State

320-566 O - 68 - 3

Employment Security agency undertakes the payment of the training allowances, subject to Federal reimbursement. The Secretary of Labor may make payments to the States for expense incurred in carrying out these agreements.

In like manner, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare enters into agreements with the States to provide institutional training which include payment for training costs. The State and local vocational education agencies develop courses and provide or arrange for training facilities, equipment, and instructional staff for occupational training courses. In the event a State does not provide the adequate training under an agreement, or if a State does not enter into an agreement, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may contract directly with the public or private educational or training institutions.

Manpower Administration Research and Special Programs

Manpower research as authorized under MDTA is funded by the Department of Labor through contracts or grants to academic institutions, other Federal agencies, State and local government organizations and individuals with research capabilities in the manpower area. Grants may be awarded only to public or private non-profit organizations or to individuals associated with such organizations. The Department coordinates its program of research with closely related programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Title I MDTA Contributions to Equal Employment Opportunity

The Manpower Administration, under Title I of MDTA, conducts a research program and an experimental and demonstration program which make important contributions to equal employment opportunity.

The Office of Manpower Research, for example, funded the very significant study by Dr. F. Ray Marshall of Negroes in Apprenticeship which has been the basis for much discussion and action in this area.

The experimental and demonstration (E&D) program is directed at learning how better to provide training and jobs for disadvantaged persons, at least half of them members of minority groups. To the extent that E&D experience has helped the operating manpower agencies to do their jobs better, through better understanding of the barriers to employment of the disadvantaged and through better understanding of the full range of services that must accompany training, it has played an important role in opening up equal employment opportunity.

Several kinds of E&D activity could be mentioned as examples of the impact of E&D on EEO.

1. *Upgrading of low income workers:* Skill Advancement Incorporated was set up by the Urban League, the Puerto Rican Forum and Cornell University in New York City to experiment with the upgrading of low-paid workers in small enterprises. SAI worked with employers in plastics, electrical components and hospitals, to open up promotional opportunities by restructuring jobs providing a 40-hour high-intensity training program leading to guaranteed raises and promotions and leaving with the employer the capacity to continue such training with his own resources. This activity was successful enough in its first year that it is now being extended to three

additional cities. It has great potential for helping minority group workers move out of the low-paid dead-end jobs to which so many are relegated.

2. *Hire First Train Later:* JOBS NOW in Chicago was the pioneer in this approach which is now being applied in most of the CEP programs. This project recruits hard-core youth, provides them a two-week orientation and places them on good jobs. The employers agree to accept these trainees and to work closely with them, often through a fellow employee "buddy." The project provides a continuing coach who works with the new employee and with the employer to smooth the rough spots. JOBS NOW is accumulating an impressive amount of useful experience and is also providing consultation to managements desiring to improve their hiring of disadvantaged persons. This approach is also assisted in the Federal Government by E&D support in San Francisco of a training program to assist disadvantaged persons hired temporarily into Federal jobs to pass qualifying civil service exams. Both experiences should have a major impact on the hiring of minority group members.

3. *Minority Group Self-Help:* Through E&D support to OIC's in 17 cities, to the Urban League's Project ASSIST in six cities, to SER in the Southwestern and Western States, minority groups are being helped to make their way into the job market. OIC's recruit, motivate, remediate, train, and place minority group members. SER organizes a skill bank and helps bring Mexican Americans the manpower services they need from the ongoing agencies. ASSIST has been a bridge between the Employment Service and members of minority groups.

4. *Special Techniques:* E&D projects have been helpful in developing and refining such new techniques as group guidance and work sample testing which are helpful to minority group members in overcoming some of the barriers which have kept them out of good jobs in the past. These techniques are coming into increasing use in all manpower development and training programs.

THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY OFFICE

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 provides in Section 601 that "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

Section 602 directs every Federal department to "issue rules, regulations, or orders" that will effectuate the provisions of Section 601.

The language contained in Title VI clearly acknowledges that the mere publication of regulations banning discrimination would not be sufficient to end discrimination. The Act not only states that discrimination in federally financed programs shall be prohibited and that rules and regulations so stating shall be issued, but more importantly, directs that steps shall be taken by the Federal departments and agencies concerned to see that these rules and regulations are in fact complied with.

To this end, the Department of Labor has established in the Office of the Secretary of Labor the Office of Equal Opportunity in Manpower Programs, and has delegated to the Special Assistant in charge of this office the responsibility to direct and coordinate the Department's civil rights program.

Responsibilities of the Special Assistant

The Special Assistant is authorized to assume jurisdiction over all matters involving the achievement of the objectives of Title VI. Since October 1965 the Special Assistant has been provided with a staff of compliance officers who, under his direct supervision, have investigated complaints of discrimination and made special compliance reviews of recipients of Departmental financial assistance.

This delegation has also included the authority and responsibility to negotiate and conciliate with recipients in obtaining the intent and purpose of Title VI. Other activities of the Special Assistant include the following:

a. Reviewing actions taken by operating agencies to achieve compliance through routine compliance reviews, processing complaints, investigations, and other actions to secure compliance with Title VI.

b. Inquiring into the status of any matter pending before an operating agency including complaints or matters arising out of compliance reports, reviews, or other investigations.

c. Taking whatever appropriate action is necessary to correct noncompliance.

d. Seeing that the Manpower Administrator informs the Secretary of his finding of noncompliance after he had determined that compliance could not be secured by voluntary means.

e. Preparing reports for the Manpower Administrator to be submitted by the Secretary of Labor to Congress of the intent to suspend or terminate Federal financial assistance. Such reports are required to be filed under Sec. 602 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

f. Informing Department of Labor officials of the Department's policies on the implementation of Title VI and cooperating with operating agencies in the development of compliance procedures.

g. Assisting operating agencies and whenever necessary, recipients to obtain qualified, experienced personnel to discharge their obligations under Title VI and the implementing regulations.

h. Rendering assistance and guidance to applicants and recipients in conjunction with operating agencies, to help them comply with Title VI and the implementing regulations.

i. Providing leadership and assistance to the operating agencies in the development of training programs for the agencies and recipient personnel.

j. Explaining the Department's equal opportunity policies.

k. Providing such leadership, guidance, and technical assistance to the operating agencies as the Special Assistant may deem appropriate in helping them meet their responsibilities.

l. Coordinating relations with other agencies and offices outside the Department.

m. Consulting and informing non-governmental groups and individuals on the operation of the Department's program for implementation of Title VI.

Requirements of Applicants or Prospective Recipients

Before receiving any Federal financial assistance from the Department of Labor, each applicant or prospective recipient is to file an assurance, the form of which has been approved by the Special Assistant, that the services, financial aid, or other benefits under the program receiving Federal financial assistance are to be provided without regard to race, color, or national origin.

Complaints

Any person who believes himself or any specific class of individuals to be subjected to discrimination prohibited by Title VI or the Departmental Regulations may by himself or by a representative file a complaint in writing. In all investigations of complaints a full compliance review is also conducted.

Routine and Special Compliance Reviews

The purpose of compliance reviews is to ascertain the extent to which Title VI and the Regulations are being complied with.

A routine compliance review consists of a general review of the practices and policies of the recipients to ascertain compliance with Title VI and the Regulations. Such a review includes an analysis of:

Counseling services, testing services, etc.

Job referrals

Physical facilities

Occupational coding

Placement and training activities

These areas it is felt will reveal the validity of the commitments made by the States in signing the assurance of compliance:

Referral of Matters Within the Jurisdiction of Other Operating Agencies or Departments

Where information is received or circumstances are observed (either during an investigation, in the form of a complaint, or from any other source) indicating possible noncompliance with Title VI on the part of a recipient and the responsibility for such recipient's compliance is not that of the bureau receiving such information, the information is reported by memorandum to the National Office for transmittal to the Special Assistant.

All available information regarding the possible violation is included so that appropriate action may be taken by the agency, bureau or Department with the responsibility and to whom the Special Assistant will transmit the information. (See Appendix pp. 35-49).

THE IMPACT OF THE OFFICE

The objectives of the Equal Opportunity Office are directed toward 53 State Employment Security agencies operating through about 2,000 local offices and about 2,000 itinerant stations; 3,000 On-the-Job MDTA programs; 300 research and demonstration projects; 46,000 apprenticeship programs and a varying number of other manpower programs such as NYC, Operation Mainstream, and New Careers.

Some measure of the impact of the Office is indicated by a recent survey of new applications to the Bureau of Employment Security.

During fiscal year 1967 non-agricultural job applications to the State Employment Security agencies totaled 10,773,823. A conservative estimate would place one-fourth of those applicants in the minority category.

Compliance reviews were conducted in all States except Idaho, New Hampshire, Colorado, Washington and Alaska which have minority populations of about thee percent or less. Neither were reviews made in Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

Since compliance reviews in the States resulted in negotiations for statewide changes, it is reasonable to assume that significant numbers of these minorities were affected by improved services in the State Employment Security agencies.

320-566 O - 68 - 4

PROBLEMS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

During this period the essential direction of the program was toward complaint investigations and compliance reviews. With an average staff of 19, a total of 224 complaints were processed: 99 from BES, 19 from BAT, 32 from BWTP, 4 from OMPER and 85 which required processing and referral to other agencies having appropriate jurisdiction. Of the complaints processed, 81 complaint investigations were made by this office. A total of 614 violations were identified and corrective action achieved in all cases.

In addition to the complaint investigations 121 full compliance reviews were conducted in 47 states.

These reviews and complaint investigations revealed a wide variety of discriminatory practices. Among the practices found in the State Employment Security agencies were:

- discriminatory referrals to employers by Employment Security agencies
- inadequate and discriminatory training procedures and facilities
- segregated facilities
- undercoding and misclassification
- inadequate training of staff on civil rights and departmental regulations
- discrimination due to location and organization of offices
- acceptance of discriminatory orders
- discrimination in regard to unemployment insurance
- discriminatory service to high schools and colleges
- discriminatory counseling
- misuse of tests and test scores
- discourteous treatment of minority group members
- improper handling of discriminatory job orders
- discriminatory advertising
- lack of Negro staff
- unequal application of selection processes and tests by JAC's to select candidates for apprenticeship programs

Investigations of apprenticeship programs revealed a pattern of discriminatory practices. Nonwhites often did not have equal access to information on current or future apprenticeship programs. Standards for selection often were not identical for whites and

nonwhites. Nonwhites often were judged more rigidly than whites. When nonwhites were admitted to apprenticeship programs, often they were mistreated or provoked into withdrawing.

Discriminatory practices found in programs sponsored by OMPER and BAT's on-the-job training programs were quite similar. However, they were not as extensively found among the Experimental and Demonstration projects as in OJT. The following is a list of kinds of discriminatory practices found:

a. Physical facilities were often segregated (locker rooms, water fountains, toilet, shower)

b. Wage rates were often different between white and nonwhite

c. Work sites were often segregated

d. Differences in opportunities for advancement were often found between white and nonwhite

e. Quantitative and qualitative differences existed in training and instruction

f. Nonwhites were often assigned lower work classifications

g. Sessions and instructors were often segregated

h. Separation of trainees from project was often done without consultation

The following excerpts from reports from field investigations describe some of the discriminatory practices often found in manpower programs. These excerpts reflect some discriminatory practices and are not intended to be all inclusive:

Excerpts From Reports on Investigations of State Employment Security Agencies

Undercoding and Misclassification

Negro applicants were consistently assigned occupational classifications for low-skilled traditional jobs despite their qualifications for other work, while white applicants with the same or inferior qualifications were assigned higher classifications. Negro applicants qualified for nontraditional employment were seldom assigned classifications which would provide opportunity for referral to such employment.

A substantial number of Negro applicants were arbitrarily considered casual or day workers and were not registered in the proper office, thus depriving many qualified for other occupations and desiring regular work of an opportunity to have their qualifications for regular work represented in the application file.

A Negro MDTA graduate was misclassified after completion of stenographer training.

The Labor and Domestic Office served all applicants without preparing applications for them, thus treating these applicants, virtually all of whom were Negro, as casual laborers or domestic day workers. This practice deprived those qualified for occupations not handled by this office of an opportunity to have their qualifications for regular employment represented in the application files.

Negro high school students were generally assigned lower classifications than white students with similar educational achievements and other qualifications.

A relatively large number of Negro applicants were apparently underutilized in terms of their educational achievement and the low level of skill at which they were employed.

Negro youths served at the YOC's were assigned lower classifications than white youths with comparable education and work histories.

White clerical applicants having no experience generally received the full clerk-typist codes while many Negro clerical applicants having work experience (and often several years of college) received mere entry codes. For example, it is indicated that an 18-year-old white female high school graduate with a typing speed of 50 wpm and no work experience was coded as a clerk-typist; on the other hand, a minority applicant, also 18 and a high school graduate, was only coded as typist. Yet she had previous experience and a typing speed of 53 wpm. At least one Negro in this office with a Master's degree was coded as a construction worker.

A Negro applicant with a Master's degree in theology was coded as a dishwasher.

Discriminatory Referrals

Referrals were made to employers on the basis of race.

Some staff were referring job applicants according to their knowledge or understanding of employers' practices with respect to race, although employers did not express discriminatory specifications in giving orders.

Minority group applicants were discriminated against in referral to jobs by getting fewer referrals and referrals to lower paying and less desirable jobs. Qualified minority applicants for white-collar jobs were rarely referred.

Referrals were made on a discriminatory basis in selected occupations and selected industries. In a sample of 109 referrals to jobs in insurance, banking, finance, medical, government trainees, bakery, sales clerk, and service representatives, only four of the referrals were nonwhite.

Domestic workers were referred in accordance with racial specifications of orders.

Referral on the basis of previous experience, where no previous experience was required, excluded Negroes.

The Professional, Clerical, and Sales Office failed to refer qualified Negro applicants to nontraditional jobs in retail stores, banks, finance and loan firms, and other business and industrial establishments.

Staff asked employers whether they wanted Negro or Mexican applicants.

One interviewer stated that discriminatory orders were no longer taken and that he no longer asked employers whether they wanted white or Negro applicants. He stated, however, that when he found a qualified applicant who was interested in a job, he called the employer and mentioned the applicant's race.

Negro applicants were discriminated against in selection and referral of applicants to jobs in the clerical and sales occupations which required no experience or skills and referrals for semiskilled jobs with certain employers.

The requirement that youths selected in YOC's for referral be approved by the placement staff of the Industrial Office before referral amounts to double screening which may result in discrimination.

MDTA graduates were referred on a discriminatory basis.

Placement assistance to Negro graduates of MDTA training programs was inferior to the placement assistance afforded to white graduates.

The lone Negro graduate of an MDTA course for clerk-stenographer was the only one of eight not placed.

Sixteen Negro youth were not served at a newly opened YOC when they came in a group from an outlying area.

Inadequate and Discriminatory Training Procedures and Facilities

No minority group member was on the MDTA Advisory Committee.

There was discrimination in the selection of trainees and their referral to MDTA courses.

Negro youth were not being recruited for and referred to apprenticeship training programs.

Methods of selection of trainees for apprentice-entry bricklayer courses did not afford minority persons and others an opportunity to be considered for selection for this training.

Selection of MDTA training courses appeared to have been conducted on a discriminatory basis; *few Negro applicants had been selected for training in nontraditional occupations,* especially combination welder, auto parts salesmen, refrigeration mechanic, calculating machine operator, and electrical appliance servicemen.

There was a failure to provide Negro applicants with full information concerning MDTA training opportunities and plans while providing white applicants with such information.

Segregated Facilities

Separate restroom facilities for the manager and assistant manager of the Labor and Domestic Office, who were white, and separate toilet facilities for janitor, generally Negroes, in the other offices, constituted segregated toilet facilities for employees.

Separate seating of unskilled and domestic applicants resulted in racial segregation.

Seating arrangements had the appearance of segregated seating in that seats were arranged on opposite sides of the rooms and persons of the same race sat together on one side.

Negro and white staff were separated by a planter.

Itinerant services provided at county courthouses contained segregated restrooms and drinking fountains.

In some instances Negro staff members were permitted to work only with Negro applicants.

The Labor and Domestic Office had a totally Negro staff, with the exception of the manager and assistant manager, and most of the Negro personnel in the city were stationed in that office.

The location of an office in the Negro neighborhood and the selective assignment of occupations to this office resulted in its clientele being more than 90 percent Negro.

Some Mexican American and Negro applicants who should be served at the Clerical and Professional Office were served only at the Industrial Office.

The organization and operation of the system of YOC's resulted in some minority youth not receiving exposure to the better job and training opportunities and in limiting some to opportunities within their neighborhoods. Boundaries of some YOC's have been shifted to include or exclude certain groups.

An MDTA course in cosmetology was conducted on a segregated basis.

Inadequate Training of Staff on Civil Rights and Nondiscrimination

Employees were not provided with copies of the signed Assurance of Compliance or of 29 CFR 31.

No training conferences on civil rights and nondiscrimination were held for staff.

The staff was not adequately trained in proper handling of discriminatory job orders and on nondiscriminatory practices in general.

Posters Not Adequately Displayed

Titles VI and VII posters were not displayed.

Titles VI and VII posters were not displayed at itinerant and reception points.

Racial Statements on Application Cards

Comments strongly indicative of race appeared on application cards.

Application cards bore comments on hair length and color, skin color and marks, and the appearance of the applicant which suggested race. The listings of local high schools from which the applicants had graduated were sent to employers on profile lists.

Acceptance of Discriminatory Job Orders

Racially discriminatory orders were accepted.

Orders specifying sex where it was not a bona fide occupational qualification were accepted.

Orders for domestic workers designated the race of workers wanted and were accepted.

Orders containing a specification limiting applicants to residents of a particular area were accepted and appeared to be discriminatory because of the predominantly racial characteristics of most urban residential areas.

Discrimination in Regard to Unemployment Insurance

Unemployment Insurance claimants were scheduled by race, and racially separate benefit rights interviews were conducted.

Group interviews on benefit rights were held on a racially segregated basis.

Claimants were being unjustly disqualified because of race, color, or national origin.

Discriminatory Service to High Schools and Colleges

Services to Negro high schools under the cooperative school program were not equal to those provided to white high schools.

The lone Negro high school served did not receive the services provided for white schools.

Services were not provided to Negro high schools under the cooperative school program, but some white high schools were serviced.

The cooperative school program had not been provided to a Negro high school despite repeated requests for these services by the principal.

Proficiency testing was not being provided at any Negro high school, but was provided at white high schools.

The YOC's assisted four white high schools with placements in connection with their distributive education programs, but did not assist the two Negro schools that had such programs.

A special service had been established for students at white colleges, but students at Negro colleges did not receive such service.

Discriminatory Counseling

Negro applicants were placed in or counseled toward menial jobs despite qualifications or potential for employment at higher levels.

Negroes comprised only 12 percent of the applicants counseled, but 25 percent of the applicants registered. The receptionist identified most of the applicants as needing counseling.

Counseling services rendered to Negro applicants were inferior in quantity and quality to that provided to white applicants; i.e., few Negroes were counseled. When counseled, Negroes were not counseled in terms of their highest vocational potential but in terms of opportunities traditionally open to Negroes.

The skills, knowledges, and abilities of nonwhite applicants were not thoroughly explored by interviewers.

Negro applicants had been offered information limited to agricultural and menial opportunities, while white applicants were provided with information about government jobs and military enlistments on their bulletin boards or information tables.

Misuse of Tests and Test Scores

Tests and test scores are not being used in accordance with employment security standards.

Most Negro applicants who were assigned classifications in the 0 and 1 code groups were tested, while most white applicants with similar qualifications and backgrounds were not.

Applicants were scheduled to take the GATB in racially segregated groups.

Discourteous Treatment of Minority Members

Some staff members addressed Negroes by their first names, but addressed white applicants by their last names with the proper title (Mr., Miss, or Mrs.).

Negro applicants were sometimes improperly dealt with or treated rudely or in a manner different from treatment afforded white applicants.

People with Spanish surnames were discourteously treated.

Negroes seeking service had been treated discourteously and told to "let Dr. Martin Luther King find them work."

Improper Handling of Discriminatory Job Orders

No effort was made by the local office manager, placement supervisor, or minority groups representative to obtain rescission of discriminatory specifications on orders after employers had refused to withdraw them at the request of the order taker.

Copies of discriminatory orders were not sent to the State Fair Employment Practice Authority.

Discriminatory specifications given by employers were not written on the order form, but upon separate slips of paper which were attached to the order forms when they were turned over to the local office minority groups representative.

Employer records containing information concerning discriminatory employer hiring practices were being destroyed rather than used affirmatively in informing such employers of Federal and State laws prohibiting discrimination in employment and encouraging them to adopt nondiscriminatory employment practices.

Discrimination as a Result of Language

No staff member spoke Spanish even though the office had a heavy Spanish-speaking clientele. Thus, applicants either had to bring an interpreter with them or risk filing an inadequate or incorrect claim.

Informational materials in Spanish were not distributed in such a manner that would ensure that all who might benefit from such information received copies.

Spanish-speaking claimants, unable to speak English, were given benefit rights interviews in English.

Discrimination Against Indians

At the time of the review there were a total of 61 Indian applicants, none of whom were classified as sales clerks, two of whom were classified as waitresses and five in office clerical classifications. None of these applicants had ever been referred to jobs as sales clerks, waitresses or to clerical positions.

One applicant had experience in sales, two years typing training and training in cosmetology. Her only classifications were as dishwasher and maid.

Another had one and a half years of college, experience and training in electronic assembly and as a service station attendant. His application showed he preferred electronic assembly work. His only classification was as a construction worker, and his only referrals were to spot labor jobs.

Comparing these Indians with white applicants emphasizes the problem. Two whites without any experience received classifications as sales clerk.

Excerpts from Investigations of an On-the-Job Training Review

Negroes must be tested prior to employment; whites are employed first and tested later.

Negroes did not receive the same training as whites.

Training meetings were held for white job sitters; Negroes who were hired as job sitters were not told of these meetings or permitted to attend.

Differences were found in the length of time spent in instruction and the details of instruction given to whites as opposed to Negroes.

White foremen supervise both Negroes and whites; the one Negro foreman supervises Negroes only.

On some shifts there are departments made up of all Negroes or all whites.

One Negro was fired because he was said not to be performing up to work standards. There was information that he had not been given proper instruction and training on how to do the work he was performing.

Discrimination on the Basis of Sex

In most Employment Service offices throughout the United States it was found that there was little deliberate discrimination on the basis of sex. However, because of tradition, many job categories were referred on the basis of sex nearly 100 percent of the time. For example, there was hardly an instance of a referral being made for a female heavy truck driver or for a male stenographer or baby sitter.

In a few offices it was found that numerous, and in some cases all, referrals were made on the basis of sex even though sex was not a bona fide specification. For example, the job orders noted "male" or "female" for such categories as picture framemaker, laboratory tester, editorial assistant, statement clerk, timekeeper, kitchen helper and many others where it is clear that these categories do not require sex as a bona fide specification.

Where it was found that an office did indeed discriminate on the basis of sex in any of its activities, the State agency was informed of the provisions of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act. In every case, there was no resistance to this part of the law. However, many problems remain because of tradition.

Progress in Assuring Equal Opportunity in All Manpower Programs

While the extent of discriminatory practices in manpower programs should in no way be minimized, it is only fair to state that State and local officials more often than not are indicating sensitivity to the problem and are moving toward compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Negotiations between the Equal Opportunity Office and State and local administrators have produced a great variety of far-reaching changes in many of the manpower programs.

Some typical agreements to effect these changes are listed as follows:

Steps would be taken to make certain that appropriate classifications are assigned to persons classified in service occupations and all application cards in the domestic and service fields in the active files would be reviewed with the objective of expanding the exposure of applicants to other jobs for which they were qualified through assignment of different and additional classifications.

Steps would be taken to improve the image of State Employment Security agencies by establishing local MDTA committees made up of all segments of the community. Local managers' contacts with the nonwhite communities would be extended to include nonwhite community leaders.

State Employment Security agencies would exert more effort to recruit nonwhite staff through the State Merit Systems. This is to include continuing visits to colleges and universities, including predominantly Negro schools.

Periodic checks would be made of classification practices in each local office and the results of such checks would be reported through the respective lines to the State offices.

Local offices would review the results of job referrals to detect possible racial discrimination and to follow up with employers who appear to discriminate.

Agencies would undertake a broad program of training on civil rights to assure that all staff members are thoroughly familiar with laws, policies, regulations and procedures established to assure nondiscrimination in services.

Intensified efforts would be made to place nonwhite graduates of MDTA white-collar courses.

The terms of revised Section 1294, Part II, Employment Security Manual, would be carried out in all offices with respect to employers who do not give discriminatory job orders, but apparently reject qualified applicants of a particular group because of their race, color, or national origin.

The provision of separate facilities for whites and nonwhites would be discontinued.

Civil Rights posters would be displayed in all State Employment Security offices and itinerant points.

A great number and variety of far-reaching changes have taken place in the manpower programs as a result of the agreements reached between the Equal Opportunity Office and State administrators.

Reclassification has resulted in an expansion of employment opportunities for minorities in other than traditional jobs. Enforcement of the Departmental policy forbidding service to employers who discriminate has enabled minorities to obtain jobs in the private sector that historically had been denied to them. Segregated facilities have been eliminated. The quality of counseling services to minorities has improved. Testing instruments for minorities have been called into question and their use as exclusionary devices is now being challenged. Increasingly, through the efforts of this office, minority youth are making breakthroughs in the apprenticeship programs.

The percent of nonwhite trainees enrolled under MDTA institutional programs has shown a steady increase since 1963. Nonwhite participation has increased as shown below:

1963.....	27.2
1964.....	30.6
1965.....	36.0
1966.....	40.2

The Workers Defense League and other organizations working in conjunction with the building and construction trades councils have set up programs in 20 cities using Manpower Administration monies, for apprenticeship-entrance-test preparation projects for minority group youth.

The concept which Negroes have of the Employment Service has improved, and higher quality minority applicants are utilizing clerical and professional offices not previously used.

Personal relationships between recipients and beneficiaries of services have improved.

State agencies have been provided with guidelines pertaining to Title VI responsibilities to withhold all services from employers with discriminatory hiring practices.

In the NYC, racial and ethnic composition of the project staff is made in keeping with the characteristics of the poverty population of the area served.

By sending mixed crews to public facilities previously used only by one race, NYC has encouraged members of other races to use these facilities.

Stepped up activities since 1962 have resulted in small increases in the numbers of minorities in State Employment Security agencies across the nation in areas having a large proportion of minorities. These increases are evident in management-professional and clerical categories. New Jersey, for example, had a total minority staffing of 257 in 1962. The figure increased to 359 in 1967. The mangement and professional category jumped from 171 to 234. Mississippi showed an increase in management and professional positions going from 0 in 1962 to 6 in 1967. South Carolina showed an increase in management and professional occupations during this period going from 0 in 1962 to 4 in 1967. Arizona had 17 minorities in 1962 in professional and management categories and 54 in 1967.

Despite some gains in employment in State Employment Security agencies for minorities, the picture will need to be greatly changed to reflect equitable staffing patterns.

New Departmental Policies and Procedures to Implement Title VI

To further implement its policy of nondiscrimination in federally supported programs and to expand job opportunities for nonwhites, a policy and procedure was initiated by the Equal Opportunity Office and developed by the Bureau of Employment Security regarding employers known to have discriminatory employment practices.

This policy described in Employment Security Manual Part II, Section 1290 instructs the employment service to "make no referral to a position where services to be performed or the terms of conditions of employment are contrary to Federal, State or local laws."

Section 1294 provides that wherever a State Employment Security agency refers applicants to an employer whom the State agency knows has discriminatory hiring practices, the State agency is in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and its implementing regulations which prohibit discrimination in programs receiving Federal financial assistance.

When patterns of discriminatory hiring practices have been established, the local office manager or the supervisor is instructed to visit the employer to inform him of the requirements of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the regulations of the Secretary of Labor to effectuate that title.

To continue to receive services, the employer is requested to give assurance that he will not continue to discriminate on the basis of race, color or national origin. If such assurance is given the local office closely reviews the referrals made after the assurance to determine whether or not the employer is discriminating. If no change is observed in the discriminatory practices, the employer is informed that the office can no longer serve him because of these practices, and all services are to be discontinued.

If the employer refuses to give assurance against discriminatory practices the local Employment Service office can no longer serve him.

Notice of these discriminatory practices and of discontinuance of service is sent to all other local offices that may serve an employer, appropriate State and local fair employment practice authorities, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission if the employer is subject to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. If the employer has a Federal contract, the contracting Federal agency and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance of the U.S. Department of Labor is also notified. If such service is discontinued to a Federal establishment, notice is sent to the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

Recording of Racial Data

To assure against discrimination and to promote affirmative action programs to eliminate disadvantages resulting from discrimination, the Secretary of Labor has determined that the race, color and national origin of claimants shall be recorded on office records in State Employment Security agencies.

These data are not to be used for placement purposes, but only for purposes of evaluating, planning and improving programs.

The instructions became effective on August 1, 1967. However, to date some agencies have indicated that they are unable to comply with the policy because State laws prohibit

the recording of racial data. These States are West Virginia, Delaware, Colorado, Missouri, Alaska, Ohio, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania and Puerto Rico.

Efforts by the Bureau of Employment Security are continuing to bring these States into compliance.

The Government Recruitment, Education and Training Program

A report on "Minority Group Staffing in Employment Security Agencies" issued in February 1967 indicates a vast inequity in minority group employment on agency staffs. This report revealed the percentage of Negroes employed in certain categories to be as follows:

Percentage of Negroes in Employment Security Agencies, 1967:	9.4
Managerial-Supervisory:	3.5
Professional-Technical:	7.3
Clerical-Office:	12.1
Custodial-Service:	56.0

A 1966 Census Bureau survey indicates that Negroes constitute 14.1 percent of the population of the United States. The percentage of Negro staff in Employment Security offices (9.4) is obviously below that indicated by the report on "Minority Group Staffing in Employment Security Agencies."

These data indicate that additional efforts are needed to increase minority staff in Managerial-Supervisory, Professional-Technical and clerical positions.

To bring about more equitable racial staffing patterns in State Employment Security agencies across the Nation, the Equal Opportunity Office developed a model for the recruitment, training and placement of minority groups.

The model identifies innovative recruitment, education and training techniques. It is to be used by five States in a pilot program designed to test its effectiveness in bringing more minorities into all occupational categories in State Employment Security agencies. If successful, the model will be used as a prototype for the Nation to effect more equitable racial staffing patterns in these agencies.

The response to the program by State officials has been exceedingly good and indicates a genuine desire to move ahead on this front.The State of Tennessee has already become a participant.

Reassignment of Industrial Training Advisors (ITA's)

Industrial Training Advisors have been employed by the Labor Department to recruit and train minority youth for entry into apprenticeship and other skill-training programs.

To promote the effectiveness of ITA's in achieving their objectives, they were detailed to the Equal Opportunity Office and assigned to Workers Defense Leagues projects in cities where the Leagues have contracts or to other groups which have similar apprenticeship outreach programs. They worked under the supervision of these groups.

The ITA's were expected to familiarize themselves thoroughly with all aspects, operations and functions of the contracts as they relate to recruitment of minorities for

apprenticeships and other skill training programs and the preparation of these youth to enter such programs. They were expected to obtain a broad knowledge of contract content and requirements.

They were to widely communicate to the minority community the opportunities available in the apprenticeship and other skill-training programs. They were to familiarize potential trainees with all of the requirements of apprenticeship programs and take affirmative steps to prepare youth to meet the specific qualifications.

Their duties, among other things, included the active recruitment of minorities for apprenticeship training. In addition to recruitment, they were to do whatever was necessary to help prepare youth for apprenticeship entry tests and to facilitate their entry into apprenticeship and other skill-training programs. These duties included assistance in obtaining required papers such as high school transcripts, police department clearances, health records, references and whatever other papers are required by JAC's or other qualifying groups to establish eligibility.

They were to assist prospective trainees in remedying educational or other deficiencies that should be removed to insure eligibility for skill training. They were to give guidance relative to appropriate dress, decorum and types of questions asked at oral interviews. ITA's were to familiarize prospective trainees with actual locations where applications are made and the time for making applications. When necessary, they were to accompany the prospective trainees to these designated locations.

The ITA's were instructed to visualize themselves as having personal responsibility for all steps and activities necessary to insure recruitment, preparation and placement of minority youth in apprenticeship or other skill-training programs.

The ultimate objective of the assignment of ITA's to this office was to enable them to return to their regions to work with contractors who have apprenticeship outreach contracts or other qualifying groups who are recruiting and preparing minority youth for apprenticeship and other skill training programs.

FOCUS ON THE FUTURE

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 has opened a whole new field which calls for new materials, techniques and methods. Complaint investigations and compliance reviews, while a necessary and essential component of a civil rights program, will not achieve the quality and quantity of compliance to the law and Departmental regulations that is required by the tensions of the times and America's commitment to equality of opportunity.

The evidence is strong that effective achievement of the goals of the program will depend in good measure on the capability of the Equal Opportunity Office to educate communities to the objectives of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Departmental rules and regulations and to provide technical assistance at the local level to enable recipients to come into compliance with Title VI and Departmental rules and regulations.

A technical assistance staff is envisioned whose functions will be providing assistance at the local level to recipients to enable them to come into compliance with Title VI and Departmental rules and regulations. Some of the functions of the technical assistance staff will be tied to a vigorous follow-up program pursuant to negotiations and conciliations designed to assist local recipients to achieve remedies to violations. In addition to the follow-up activities, this component will also develop technical materials and other publications to be used to train and educate recipients at the local level to the requirements of the Civil Rights program.

It will develop and implement a broad educational program designed to reduce complaints and to develop the capability at the local level to carry on manpower programs free from discriminatory practices.

In addition, the technical assistance component will provide onsite assistance to recipients and local communities to bring diverse groups together to further Title VI objectives, work with public schools, colleges and universities across the country to develop a greater awareness of the expanding opportunities for minorities and research the program for effectiveness and additional program ideas.

The Department of Labor is using two organizational approaches to achieve the goals of Title VI. In one approach the compliance officers are centralized in the National Office under the administration and supervision of a single director. In the other approach the compliance officers are placed in the regional offices but report to the Special Assistant to the Bureau Administrator for Equal Opportunity in the National Office.

While the achievements of the Equal Opportunity Office for this period have been substantial, the continuing extent of discriminatory practices in the manpower programs will require expanded and spartan efforts to achieve their resolution.

# # #

APPENDIXES

Appendix 1. Complaint Investigations

STATES	BES	BAT	BWTP	AMA	OTHER
Total	46	19	32	3	1
Alabama	5		1	2	
Arizona			1		
Arkansas	3		2		
California	2		3		
Connecticut	1	1			
Delaware			1		
Florida			1		
Georgia	2	1			1
Illinois		12			
Indiana	1				
Iowa		1			
Kansas	2				
Kentucky	1				
Louisiana	3	2	2		
Maryland	1				
Massachusetts	1	1	1		
Mississippi	5	1	4		
Missouri			1		
Nebraska	1				
Nevada	2				
New Hampshire	1				
New Jersey	1		1		
New York	1				
North Carolina	5		2		
Ohio			1		
Oklahoma	1		1	1	
Pennsylvania	3		1		
South Carolina			2		
Tennessee	1		3		
Texas	2		4		
Virginia	1				

Appendix 2. Complaint Investigations (City and State)

BES

Alabama
Birmingham
Greenville
Mobile - 2
Selma

Arkansas
Paragould
El Dorado
Helena

California
Sacramento
Riverside

Connecticut
New Haven

Georgia
Columbus
Thomasville

Indiana
Ft. Wayne

Kansas
Witchita
Topeka

Kentucky
Glasgow

Louisiana
Alexandria
Baton Rouge
New Orleans

Maryland
Frederick

Massachusetts
Boston

Mississippi
Cleveland
Corinth
Greenwood
Jackson - 2

Nebraska
Omaha

Nevada
Las Vegas - 2

New Hampshire
Manchester

New Jersey
Newark

New York
Flushing

North Carolina
Edenton
Elizabeth City
Washington
Fayetteville
Durham

Oklahoma
Oklahoma City

Pennsylvania
Chester
Pittsburgh
Philadelphia

Tennessee
Knoxville

Texas
San Angelo
Witchita Falls

Virginia
Roanoke

Appendix 3. Complaint Investigations (City and State)

BAT

Connecticut
New Haven

Georgia
Thomasville

Illinois
East St. Louis - 12

Iowa
Des Moines

Louisiana
Baton Rouge - 2

Massachusetts
New Dighton

Indiana
Evansville

AMA

Alabama
Mobile
Elmore

Oklahoma
Oklahoma City

OTHER

Georgia
Georgia State Merit System

Appendix 4. Complaint Investigations (City and State)

BWTP

Alabama
DeKalb County

Arizona
Maricopa

Arkansas
Helena - 2

California
Berkeley - 3
San Francisco - 2

Delaware
Wilmington

Florida
Bradenton

Louisiana
Opelousas - 2
Vidalia

Massachusetts
Springfield

Mississippi
Indianola - 4
Bolivar County
Gautier
Vaughan

Missouri
St. Louis

New Jersey
Paterson

North Carolina
Greenville - 2

Ohio
Columbus

Oklahoma
Oklahoma City

Pennsylvania
Philadelphia

South Carolina
Hampton - 2

Tennessee
Memphis - 3

Texas
Bastrop - 4
Greenville
Houston
New Brunswick

Appendix 5. Routine Compliance Reviews

STATES	BES	BAT	BWTP	AMA	OTHER
Total	61	6	54	0	0
Alabama	5		7		
Arizona			1		
California	3		8		
Connecticut	2		1		
Delaware	2				
Florida			5		
Georgia		1			
Illinois			3		
Indiana			1		
Iowa		1			
Kansas	4				
Louisiana	1		2		
Maine	1				
Maryland	1		1		
Michigan	1		3		
Minnesota			1		
Mississippi	8		3		
Montana	2				
Nebraska	5				
Nevada		2	1		
New Jersey	1				
New Mexico			1		
New York			1		
North Carolina	1		5		
North Dakota	2	1			
Ohio	1	1			
Pennsylvania	3				
South Carolina	1		7		
South Dakota	2				
Texas	7				
Utah	3				
Virginia	1		1		
Wisconsin			2		
Wyoming	4				

Appendix 6. Routine Compliance Reviews (City and State)

BES

Alabama
Birmingham - 2
Montgomery
Talladega

California
Salinas
Colton
Riverside

Connecticut
Hartford - 2

Kansas
Wichita - 2
Topeka
Hutchinson

Louisiana
Baton Rouge

Maine
Presque Isle

Maryland
Annapolis

Michigan
Lansing

Mississippi
Cleveland
Corinth
Meridian
Natchez
Philadelphia
West Point
Yazoo City
Laurel

Montana
Billings - 2

Nebraska
Omaha - 4

Nevada
Las Vegas

New Jersey
Newark

North Carolina
Durham

North Dakota
Fargo - 2

Ohio
Cleveland

Pennsylvania
Upper Darby
Levittown - 2

Delaware
Wilmington
Dover

South Carolina
Conway

South Dakota
Pierre
Rapid City

Texas
El Paso - 4
Houston
Lufkin
Weslaco

Utah
Salt Lake City - 3

Virginia
Alexandria

Wyoming
Casper - 2
Rawlins
Riverton

Appendix 7. Routine Compliance Reviews (City and State)

BAT

Georgia
Columbus

Iowa
Des Moines

Nevada
Las Vegas - 2

North Dakota
Fargo

Ohio
Cleveland

Appendix 8. Routine Compliance Reviews (City and State)

BWTP

Alabama
Jasper
Hamilton
Montgomery - 2
Talladega
Ft. Payne
Calera

Arizona
Phoenix

California
Oakland - 2
Roseville
San Diego - 2
Vallejo
Anaheim
San Jose

Connecticut
Hartford

Florida
Tampa - 3
Miami - 2

Illinois
Blue Island
Springfield
Sagamon County
Kankakee

Indiana
Vigo County

Louisiana
Kinder
Metairie

Maryland
Baltimore

Michigan
Muskegon - 2
Grand Rapids

Minnesota
Duluth

Mississippi
Cleveland - 2
Yazoo City

Nevada
Reno

New Mexico
Carlstad

New York
Oswego

North Carolina
Rocky Mt.
Monroe
Williamston - 2
Wadesboro

South Carolina
Allendale
Orangeburg - 3
Greenville
Charleston - 3

Virginia
Danville

Wisconsin
Milwaukee
Menominee County

Appendix 9. Number of Complaints

STATES	BES	BAT	BWTP	AMA	OTHER
Total	98	19	17	4	86
Alabama	6		3	3	3
Arizona	2		1		
Arkansas	2		2		2
California	5				5
Colorado	1				2
Connecticut	1				1
District of Columbia	1				1
Florida	7				4
Georgia	2	1			2
Idaho					1
Illinois	3	12			3
Indiana					1
Iowa	1				1
Kansas			1		1
Kentucky	1				1
Louisiana	6	1			5
Maryland	4				
Massachusetts	1				2
Michigan					3
Minnesota	1				
Mississippi	7		3		7
Missouri	2				
Montana	1				
Nebraska	1				
Nevada	1				
New Hampshire	1				
New Jersey	2				2
New Mexico	1				
New York	6		1		8
North Carolina	3		1		4
Ohio	3		2		1
Oklahoma	3			1	4
Oregon		1			
Pennsylvania	4	1	1		2
South Carolina	1		1		2
South Dakota					2
Tennessee	2				4
Texas	13		3		9
Virginia	1	1			2
Washington	1				
West Virginia					1
Wisconsin	1				

Appendix 10. Number of Complaints (City and State)

BES

Alabama
Mobile - 3
Decatur
Ozark
Birmingham

Arizona
Phoenix - 2

Arkansas
Helena
Paragould

California
Modesto
San Francisco
Sacramento
San Diego
Riverside

Colorado
Denver

Connecticut
Bridgeport

Florida
Jacksonville
West Palm Beach
Melbourne
Tampa
Tallahassee
Orlando
Leesburg

Georgia
Waycross - 2

Illinois
Oak Lawn
Chicago - 2

Iowa
Des Moines

Kentucky
Glasgow

Louisiana
Shreveport
Breaux Bridges
Minden - 2
New Orleans - 2

Maryland
Frederick
Annapolis
Cambridge
Easton

Massachusetts
Boston

Minnesota
Minneapolis

Mississippi
Jackson - 3
Marks
General
Greenwood
Cleveland

Missouri
St. Louis
Chillicothe

Montana
Billings

Nebraska
Omaha

Nevada
Las Vegas

New Hampshire
Manchester

New Jersey
Newark
Paterson

New Mexico
Alamogardo

New York
New York City - 4
Rochester
Long Island

North Carolina
Blounts Creek
Durham
Raleigh

Ohio
Cleveland
Toledo
Columbus

Oklahoma
Oklahoma City - 2
Tulsa

Appendix 10. Number of Complaints (Cont'd)

BES

Pennsylvania
Philadelphia - 2
Pittsburgh
Chester

South Carolina
Sumter

Tennessee
Knoxville
Harriman

Texas
Houston - 3
Fort Worth - 2
El Paso - 2
Garland
Longview
Dallas
Madisonville
Wichita Falls
Lufkin

Virginia
Farmville

Washington
Pasco

Wisconsin
Milwaukee

Appendix 11. Number of Complaints (City and State)

BAT

Georgia
Thomasville

Illinois
East St. Louis - 12

Louisiana
Baton Rouge

Ohio
Cleveland
Cincinnati

Oregon
Milwaukee

Pennsylvania
Pittsburgh

Virginia
Petersburg

Appendix 12. Number of Complaints (City and State)

BWTP

Alabama
Selma
Montgomery
Valley Head

Arizona
Phoenix

Arkansas
Helena
Luxora

Kansas
Atchinson

Mississippi
Bolivar County
Moss Point
Vaughan

New York
New York

North Carolina
Greenville

Pennsylvania
Philadelphia

South Carolina
Hampton

Texas
New Braunfels - 2
Houston

AMA

Alabama
Elmer County - 2
Mobile

Oklahoma
Oklahoma City

Appendix 13. Complaints Referred to Other Agencies

Eighty-six (86) complaints from 29 States, the District of Columbia, and 76 cities were referred to other agencies for action. In addition to these written complaints, approximately three informal, oral complaints for each of 121 compliance reviews were revealed and reported for referral to other agencies during review activities. This would total approximately 360 additional complaints referred to other agencies. These agencies include:

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
The Office of Federal Contract Compliance
The Department of Housing and Urban Development
The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
The Office of Economic Opportunity
The Department of Justice
The Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions
of the U.S. Department of Labor

The states and cities are listed below:

Alabama
Montgomery
Huntsville

Arkansas
Mariana
Alma

California
Huntington Park
Inglewood
San Diego
Los Angeles
Modesto

Colorado
Denver
Pueblo

Connecticut
Groton

Dist. of Columbia

Florida
Palm Beach
Tallahassee
Elkton
Pompano Beach

Georgia
Thomasville
Atlanta

Idaho
Pocatello

Illinois
Chicago
Kankakee

Indiana
Gary

Iowa
Waterloo

Kansas
Wichita

Kentucky
Louisville

Louisiana
Opelousas
New Orleans
Kenner
Baton Rouge

Massachusetts
Springfield

Michigan
Saginaw
Detroit
Ann Arbor

Mississippi
Gulfport
Greenwood

Appendix 13. Complaints Referred to Other Agencies (Cont'd)

Mississippi--Cont'd.
Greenville
Laurel
McComb
Jackson
Itta Bena

New Jersey
Bridgeton
New Brunswick

New York
New York City
Bronx
Brooklyn
Hastings-on-Hudson
New Rochelle

North Carolina
Rockingham
Elizabethtowne
Winston-Salem

Ohio
Cleveland

Oklahoma
Tulsa
Lawton
Sapulpa

Pennsylvania
Philadelphia
Pittsburgh

South Carolina
Dillon
Chester
Conway

South Dakota
Rapid City

Tennessee
Dyersburg
Big Spring

Tennessee--Cont'd.
Knoxville
Somerville

Texas
El Paso
Texarkana
Laredo
Port Arthur
Houston
New Waverly
New Braunfels
Dallas
Austin

Virginia
Richmond
Galax

W. Virginia
Wheeling

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1968 O - 320-566